

2024-08-14 10:20
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

201

CRM-M-37955-2023

Date of Decision : **August 13, 2024**

SATBIR JAIN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. V.D.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Ankur Malik, Advocate with
Mr. Monu Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. On 16.07.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

“It is informed by the learned State counsel, that though arrest of the petitioner was stayed vide order dated 24.08.2023, however, there is no direction to the petitioner to join the investigation with the investigating officer.

In view of the above, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation, and on his doing so, if the petitioner is sought to be arrested, he be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer.

However, the petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so, and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Adjourned to 13.08.2024.”



CRM-M-37955-2023

-2-

2. Today, the learned State counsel has, on instructions imparted to him by ASI Ajay Kumar stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove extracted order, the petitioner(s) had joined investigation and he is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

3. In view of the above, the hereinabove extracted interim order dated 16.7.2024, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

“(i) the petitioner(s) shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall make himself/herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

4. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner(s) indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

5. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

August 13, 2024
ajay-1

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No